

H. Tim Hoffman (SBN 49141)
 Arthur W. Lazear (SBN 83603)
 Chad A. Saunders (SBN 257810)
 HOFFMAN & LAZEAR
 180 Grand Ave., Ste. 1550
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 763-5700
 Facsimile: (510) 835-1311

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 DAWN TILL and MARY JOSEPHS

Jennifer B. Zargarof (SBN 204382)
 jzargarof@sidley.com
 Geoffrey D. DeBoskey (SBN 211557)
 gdeboskey@sidley.com
 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000
 Los Angeles, California 90013
 Telephone: (213) 896-6000
 Facsimile: (213) 896-6600

Attorneys for Defendants
 SAKS INCORPORATED, SAKS & COMPANY and
 SAKS FIFTH AVENUE, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAWN TILL and MARY JOSEPHS,
 individually, and on behalf of all others
 similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SAKS INCORPORATED, a Tennessee
 corporation; SAKS FIFTH AVENUE, INC., a
 Massachusetts corporation; SAKS &
 COMPANY, a New York corporation; and
 SAKS FIFTH AVENUE OFF FIFTH, ,

Defendants.

) Case No. 4:11-cv-00504-SBA

) Assigned to: Hon. Sandra Brown Armstrong

) **STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~**
) **ORDER RE BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR**
) **DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DENY**
) **CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION**

) [Complaint filed: February 2, 2011]
) [FAC filed: March 8, 2011]

1 **IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED** by and among Plaintiffs Dawn Till and
 2 Mary Josephs (“Plaintiffs”) through their counsel, and Defendants Saks Incorporated, Saks &
 3 Company, and Saks Fifth Avenue, Inc., (“Defendants”) through their counsel, (collectively, the
 4 “Parties”) to the following pursuant to Civil L.Rs. 7-12 and the Court’s Order Dated September 22,
 5 2012 (Dkt. 73):

6 1. On September 22, 2012 the Court issued an Order Granting in Part and Denying in
 7 Part Stipulated Motion to Re-file Enlarged Briefs re: Class Certification. (Dkt. 73) The Court’s
 8 Order set out a briefing schedule for Plaintiff’s Motion for Class Certification, and stated that “to the
 9 extent that Plaintiffs do not seek conditional certification in their motion for class certification with
 10 respect to their claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, Defendants may file motions to deny
 11 conditional certification.”

12 2. On October 2, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Class Certification. (Dkt. 74)
 13 Plaintiffs do not seek conditional certification in their motion for class certification with respect to
 14 their claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

15 3. Defendants are filing a motion to deny conditional certification, which Plaintiffs
 16 intend to oppose, for the reasons that will be stated in their respective briefs.

17 4. Accordingly, the Parties have met and conferred, and have agreed to the following
 18 briefing schedule for Defendants’ Motion to Deny Conditional Certification: Defendant’s Motion to
 19 Deny Conditional Certification is due on or before October 23, 2012, Plaintiff’s opposition is due on
 20 or before November 6, 2012, and Defendants’ reply is due on or before November 13, 2012.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

1 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

2 DATED: OCTOBER 11, 2012

HOFFMAN & LAZEAR

3
4 By: /s/Chad A. Saunders

Chad A. Saunders

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

5
6 DATED: OCTOBER 11, 2012

Sidley Austin LLP

7
8 By: /s/Jennifer B. Zargarof

Jennifer B. Zargarof

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS

9
10
11 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: 10/16/12



13
14 Honorable Sandra Brown Armstrong
Judge of the United States District Court